

Appl. No. 10/509,099
Amdt. dated January 18, 2006
Reply to Office action of November 1, 2005
Atty. Docket No. AP930USN

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the examiner drew attention to a typographical error on page 1, line 13. It is believed that the error in question, an incorrect numeral "3", occurred on page 4, line 13. The error has been corrected by substitution of the numeral "13".

In paragraph 3, the examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pankinaho (US 6,297,776) and, in paragraph 4, rejected the same claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bokhari *et al.* (US 5,646,634).


In paragraph 5, the examiner indicated that claims 3-6 and 8-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In paragraph 6, the examiner allowed claim 18.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been cancelled and claims 3 - 6, 8, 10, 11 and 15 have been rewritten as required. Claims 2 and 7 have been made dependent upon claim 3 and so are allowable with it.

For the record, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 7 as anticipated by Bokhari *et al.* was without merit. Bokhari *et al.*'s antenna is tuned by adjusting the rotating plate 52 to vary the length of the slits 46 - 49 in antenna element 43. Contrary to the examiner's statement in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Bokhari *et al.* do not say that their ground plate 42 is flexible or adjusted to tune the antenna.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all claims now of record are patentable over the cited references and early and favourable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Adams, Reg. No. 31,078